



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/676,686	09/30/2003	Lai Theng Chee	ITL2003US (P17250)	8211
47795 7590 09/29/2009 TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C. 1616 S. VOSS RD., SUITE 750 HOUSTON, TX 77057-2631				
EXAMINER				
HILLERY, NATHAN				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2176				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
09/29/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/676,686

Applicant(s)

CHEE ET AL.

Examiner

NATHAN HILLERY

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 June 2009.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 5-7 and 19-29 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 5-7 and 19-29 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Amendment filed on 6/8/09.
2. Claims 5 – 7 and 19 – 29 are pending in the case. Claims 5 and 19 are independent.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 5 – 7 and 22 – 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kent et al., (Microsoft Office 2003 Super Bible eBook), and further in view of McConnell (US 20020075040 A1).
5. **Regarding independent claim 5**, Kent et al. teach that tasks and events are examples of SharePoint lists. Lists provide a place to store and present data in a convenient, standardized format with some level of customization available. You can add and remove columns in lists and change the order of fields in a list. The information stored in lists is available for export to many Office 2003 applications (p 399, Adding items to existing lists), which meet the limitation of **receiving, in a task extractor of the computer system, a first modified task having a first task update in response to an operation initiated by the task extractor, the first modified task corresponding to a first task that is extracted from a first document into a task repository , the first document corresponding to a first application;**

Kent et al. teach that if the attached file is a Word, Excel, or PowerPoint file, the copy of the file received by the recipient is linked directly to the newly created Shared "Workspace. The recipient can save and work on the file locally and synchronize changes with the copy stored in the Shared Workspace (p 413), which meet the limitation of **receiving, in the task extractor, a second modified task having a second task update in response to the operation initiated by the task extractor, the second modified task corresponding to a second task that is extracted from a second document into the task repository, the second document corresponding to a second application;**

Kent et al. teach that now that you have an Excel spreadsheet linked to a SharePoint list you can add data to the list from within SharePoint or within Excel and easily synchronize those changes (p 407), which meet the limitation of **synchronizing, in a task synchronizer of the computer system, the first task with the first modified task by updating the task repository with the first task update; and**

Kent et al. teach you can also synchronize an Access table that is linked to a SharePoint list (p 407), which meet the limitation of **synchronizing, in the task synchronizer, the second task with the second modified task by updating the task repository with the second task update.**

Kent does not explicitly teach **using a first circuit of the task extractor, using the first circuit of the task extractor, using a second circuit of the task synchronizer, using the second circuit of the task synchronizer.**

McConnell teaches that **using a first circuit of the task extractor, using the first circuit of the task extractor, using a second circuit of the task synchronizer, using the second circuit of the task synchronizer** (paragraph block 0024).

Because both Kent and McConnell teach methods of executing tasks, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to substitute one method for the other to achieve the predictable result of using circuits.

6. **Regarding dependent claim 6**, Kent et al. teach that the information stored in lists is available for export to many Office 2003 applications (p 399, Adding items to existing lists), which meet the limitation of **updating the first document with the first task update by exporting the first modified task into the first document**.

7. **Regarding dependent claim 7**, Kent et al. teach that the information stored in lists is available for export to many Office 2003 applications (p 399, Adding items to existing lists), which meet the limitation of **updating the second document with the second task update by exporting the second modified task into the second document**.

8. **Regarding dependent claim 22**, Kent teaches that updating a third document with the first task update by exporting the first modified task into the third document, the third document corresponding to a different application than the first application (p 404 and Fig 17 - 5).

9. **Regarding dependent claim 23**, Kent teaches that updating the third document with the second task update by exporting the second modified task into the third document, the third document corresponding to a different application than the second application (p 404 and Fig 17 - 5).

10. **Regarding dependent claim 24**, Kent teaches that checking for modified tasks at predetermined times (p 415, penultimate paragraph).

11. **Regarding dependent claim 25**, Kent teaches that exporting the first and second modified tasks from the task repository into a single document for viewing by a user corresponding to a task owner of the first and second modified tasks (p 399 and table 17 - 1).

12. Claims 19 – 21 and 26 – 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kent et al., (Microsoft Office 2003 Super Bible eBook), and further in view of McConnell (US 20020075040 A1) and Goodspeed (US 20020065828 A1).

13. **Regarding independent claim 19**, Kent et al. teach that tasks and events are examples of SharePoint lists. Lists provide a place to store and present data in a convenient, standardized format with some level of customization available. You can add and remove columns in lists and change the order of fields in a list. The information stored in lists is available for export to many Office 2003 applications (p 399, Adding

items to existing lists), which meet the limitation of **receiving, in a task extractor of the computer system, a first modified task having a first task update in response to an operation initiated by the task extractor, the first modified task corresponding to a first task that is extracted from a first document into a task repository , the first document corresponding to a first application;**

Kent et al. teach that if the attached file is a Word, Excel, or PowerPoint file, the copy of the file received by the recipient is linked directly to the newly created Shared 'Workspace. The recipient can save and work on the file locally and synchronize changes with the copy stored in the Shared Workspace (p 413), which meet the limitation of **receiving, in the task extractor, a second modified task having a second task update in response to the operation initiated by the task extractor, the second modified task corresponding to a second task that is extracted from a second document into the task repository, the second document corresponding to a second application;**

Kent et al. teach that now that you have an Excel spreadsheet linked to a SharePoint list you can add data to the list from within SharePoint or within Excel and easily synchronize those changes (p 407 and Table 17 - 1), which meet the limitation of **synchronizing, in a task synchronizer of the computer system, the first task with the first modified task by updating the task repository and a first individual task repository associated with a first task owner of the first modified task with the first task update; and**

Kent et al. teach you can also synchronize an Access table that is linked to a SharePoint list (p 407 and Table 17 - 1), which meet the limitation of **synchronizing, in the task synchronizer, the second task with the second modified task by updating the task repository and a second individual task repository associated with a second task owner of the second modified task with the second task update.**

Kent does not explicitly teach **using a first circuit of the task extractor, using the first circuit of the task extractor, using a second circuit of the task synchronizer, using the second circuit of the task synchronizer.**

McConnell teaches that **using a first circuit of the task extractor, using the first circuit of the task extractor, using a second circuit of the task synchronizer, using the second circuit of the task synchronizer** (paragraph block 0024).

Because both Kent and McConnell teach methods of executing tasks, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to substitute one method for the other to achieve the predictable result of using circuits.

Neither Kent nor McConnell explicitly teach **wherein the first modified task is visible to the first task owner but not to other task owners; and wherein the second modified task is visible to the second task owner but not to other task owners.**

Goodspeed teaches that **wherein the first modified task is visible to the first task owner but not to other task owners; and wherein the second modified task is visible to the second task owner but not to other task owners** (paragraph block 0312).

Because both Goodspeed and the combination of Kent and McConnell teach methods of performing tasks, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to substitute one method for the other to achieve the predictable result of utilizing groups to perform specific tasks.

14. **Regarding dependent claim 20**, Kent et al. teach that the information stored in lists is available for export to many Office 2003 applications (p 399, Adding items to existing lists), which meet the limitation of **updating the first document with the first task update by exporting the first modified task into the first document**.

15. **Regarding dependent claim 21**, Kent et al. teach that the information stored in lists is available for export to many Office 2003 applications (p 399, Adding items to existing lists), which meet the limitation of **updating the second document with the second task update by exporting the second modified task into the second document**.

16. **Regarding dependent claim 26**, Kent teaches that updating a third document with the first task update by exporting the first modified task into the third document, the third document corresponding to a different application than the first application (p 404 and Fig 17 - 5).

17. **Regarding dependent claim 27**, Kent teaches that updating the third document with the second task update by exporting the second modified task into the third document, the third document corresponding to a different application than the second application (p 404 and Fig 17 - 5).

18. **Regarding dependent claim 28**, Kent teaches that checking for modified tasks at predetermined times (p 415, penultimate paragraph).

19. **Regarding dependent claim 29**, Kent teaches that exporting the first and second modified tasks from the task repository into a single document for viewing by a user corresponding to a task owner of the first and second modified tasks (p 399 and table 17 - 1).

Response to Arguments

20. Applicant's arguments filed 6/8/09 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

21. Applicant argues that Kent fails to teach that receipt of modified tasks is responsive to an operation initiated by a task extractor because, in Kent, updates are simply performed by a user updating a given list appropriately (p6, second paragraph).

First, Kent teaches that one of the central features of Windows SharePoint Services is its use of lists. Lists include such items as Announcements, Contacts, Events, Links, and Tasks and Issue Tracking (p 394, first paragraph) and that the

information stored in lists is available for export to many Office 2003 applications (p 399, Adding items to existing lists).

Thus, it is obvious that there must be a task extractor since the tasks are stored in Windows SharePoint Services lists and these tasks can be exported to many Office 2003 applications as explicitly taught in Kent.

22. Applicant argues that Kent further fails to teach that an individual task repository that is associated with a task owner is also updated with a modified task (p 6, penultimate paragraph).

Kent explains in Table 17 – 1 the different group privileges. In this table, Kent describes that certain groups can create, manage, modify and/or administer their own lists, which include tasks as stated above and which are equivalent to an individual task repository.

23. The rest of Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 5 – 7 and 19 – 21 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

24. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to NATHAN HILLERY whose telephone number is (571)272-4091. The examiner can normally be reached on M - F, 10:30 a.m. - 7:00 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, W Doug Hutton can be reached on (571) 272-4137. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 10/676,686
Art Unit: 2176

Page 12

/Nathan Hillery/
Examiner, Art Unit 2176